

Attorney Docket 57557US004
U.S.S.N. 10/501,251

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 7 and 21-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 for reason that these claims recite the phrase "or the like." With this amendment, the objected to language has been removed from claims 7 and 21-24. Accordingly, it is submitted that the § 112, ¶ 2 rejection has been overcome.

Further in the Office Action, claims 1-8 and 10-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 1,901,908 to Hoyos. With this amendment, claim 1 has been amended to recite the limitations of claim 9, which has been canceled. Since claim 9 was not rejected based upon the Hoyos patent, it is submitted that claims 1-8 and 10-24 now define patentably over the Hoyos patent.


Still further in the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5-9, 14, 17, 20, 21 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,585,023 B2 to Azuhata. The '023 patent discloses a tape holder comprising a tape guide plate 11, a tape attacher comprising a pressure roller 12 and a jig guide member comprising rollers 26 on a sub-frame 20. The adjustable mechanism associated with the jig guide member comprises the sub-frame 20, guide rods 22 and springs 25. The adjustable mechanism associated with the pressure roller 12 comprises the spring-biased sub-frame 20. The tape holder adjustable mechanism comprises the spring-biased sub-frame 20. The Azuhata apparatus lacks a jig guide member adjustable mechanism which is separate from at least one of the tape holder and the tape attacher adjustable mechanism. Instead, the same adjustable mechanism, i.e., the spring-biased sub-frame 20, is associated with each of the tape holder, the tape attacher and the jig guide member. It is noted that the Office Action reaches a similar conclusion in the last two lines on page 4, wherein it states "the tape holder, the tape attacher, and the jig guide member (17 and 26) each comprise an adjustable mechanism (20, 25)." Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 1, 2, 5-8, 14, 17, 20, 21 and 24 define patentably over the Azuhata patent.

With this paper, new dependent claim 25 has been added. For the reasons set out above with regard to claim 1, it is submitted that claim 25 also defines patentable invention over the prior art.

Attorney Docket 57557US004
U.S.S.N. 10/501,251

In view of the above remarks, applicant submits that claims 1-8 and 10-25 define patentably over the prior art. Early notification of allowable subject matter is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
STEVENS & SHOWALTER, L.L.P.

By 
Robert L. Showalter
Reg. No. 33,579

7019 Corporate Way
Dayton, OH 45459-4238
Telephone: 937-438-6848
Fax: 937-438-2124
Email: Showalter@speakeasy.net